

REMARKS

Applicants have amended their claims to clarify the invention. Claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, are amended herein to recite a communication link control card comprising a first connector in combination with a communication link comprising a length, an end, a second connector disposed on said end, and a passive transponder disposed on said second connector, wherein said first connector is interconnected to said second connector, such that said second connector is disposed external to said device adapter. Support can be found in the FIG. 3 at first connector 350 disposed on communication control link card 240 interconnected to second connector 330 disposed on an end of communication link 280.

No new matter has been entered. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-10, 12-18, and 20-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRolf et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0104039) in view of P.B. Gilliland et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,554,492), and further in view of Phillips hitag1 stick transponder ("hitag").

Claims 3, 11, and 19, stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DeRolf et al., in view of Gilliland et al., and in further view of Phillips hitag1 and Cecchi et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,466,626).

Neither DeRolf et al., nor Gilliland et al., nor Hitag, singly or in combination, teach a device adapter interconnected to said controller and comprising a first communication link control card comprising a first connector in combination with a communication link comprising a length, an end, a second connector disposed on said end, and a passive transponder disposed on said second connector, and interconnecting the first connector and the second connector,

such that the second connector is disposed external to said device adapter, as recited by claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, as amended herein.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that neither DeRolf et al., nor Gilliland et al, nor hitag, singly or in combination, teach a communication link comprising a connector disposed on an end, and a passive transponder disposed on the connector, wherein the passive transponder includes a memory comprising information including the length of the communication link, as recited by claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, as amended herein. The Examiner posits that DeRolf et al. recite such a teaching. In that regard, the Examiner avers that DeRolf teaches use of a GBIC connection, which corresponds to the connector element of claims 1, 9, 17, and 25. Applicants respectfully disagree. More specifically, DeRolf et al. nowhere teaches use of any sort of "GBIC connection" or "GBIC connector."

The Examiner further avers that a GBIC card taught by DeRolf et al. corresponds to a transponder disposed on a connector portion of a communication link. Applicants once again respectfully disagree. In FIG. 1, DeRolf et al. teach use of 12 GBIC cards, namely elements 24a, 24b, 24c, 24d, 24e, 24f, 24g, 24h, 24i, 24j, 24k, and 24 l. In each instance, the GBIC card is depicted as a first subassembly portion of second subassembly, where that second subassembly is INTERNAL to an assembly. For example, GBIC cards 24a and 24b are each disposed within Host Bus Adapters 14a and 14b, respectively, wherein Host Bus Adapters are disposed within host computer 2. Needless to say, both GBIC cards 24a and 24b are internal to different host bus adapters, which in turn are internal to one host computer.

Each of the other 10 GBIC cards shown in FIG. 1 is disposed within a Host Bus Adapter (GBICs 24e and 24f), an IPORT (GBICs 24g and 24h), or within a DPORT (GBICs

24i and 24j), or within an interface (GBICs 24c, 24d, 24k, and 24l). Host bus adapter 18a and 18b are disposed with a host computer 4. IPORTs 22a and 22b are disposed within Fabric 10. Interfaces 16a and 16b are disposed within Storage Device 6, and Interfaces 20a and 20b are disposed within Storage Device 8. In each and every instance, a GBIC taught by DeRolf et al. is a first subassembly disposed within a second subassembly, wherein the second subassembly is disposed within either a host computer, a storage device, or a communication fabric.

The Examiner incorrectly posits that DeRolf describes the GBICs as field replaceable units (“FRUs”), and therefore, those GBICs cannot be internal assemblies. Applicants respectfully disagree. A FRU can comprise an internal assembly. For example, Wikipedia defines a FRU as follows: “A Field Replaceable Unit or FRU is a circuit board, part or assembly that can be quickly and easily removed from a personal computer or other piece of electronic equipment, and replaced by the user or a technician without having to send the entire product or system to a repair facility. FRUs allow a technician lacking in-depth product knowledge to fault isolate and replace faulty components.” Applicants trust the Examiner will appreciate that a “circuit board” comprises an internal assembly in a personal computer or other piece of electronic equipment. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the GBICs of DeRolf comprise internal parts as depicted by DeRolf in the Figures.

Neither Gilliland, nor hitag, nor Cecchi et al., cure the deficiencies of DeRolf et al. Neither DeRolf et al., nor Gilliland, nor hitag, nor Cecchi et al., singly or in combination, teach a device adapter interconnected to said controller and comprising a first communication link control card comprising a first connector in combination with a communication link comprising a length, an end, a second connector disposed on said end, and a passive

transponder disposed on said second connector, and interconnecting the first connector and the second connector, such that the second connector is disposed external to said device adapter,, as recited by Applicants' claims, as amended herein. Moreover, neither DeRolf et al., nor Gilliland, nor hitag, nor Cecchi et al., singly or in combination, teach adjusting a pre-emphasis level of a signal provided by a communication link based upon information wirelessly read from a memory disposed on a connector disposed on an end of the communication link, as recited by claims 1, 9, 17, and 25, as amended herein,

Claims 2-7, as amended herein, depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, as amended herein. Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, fourth paragraph, "a claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which it refers." "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." MPEP 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed.Cir. 1988). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8, as amended herein, are patentable over DeRolf et al., Gilliland, hitag, and/or Cecchi et al.

Claims 10-16, as amended herein, depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 9, as amended herein. Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, fourth paragraph, "a claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which it refers." "If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious." MPEP 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed.Cir. 1988). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10-16, as amended herein, are patentable over DeRolf et al., Gilliland, hitag, and/or Cecchi et al.

Claims 18-24, as amended herein, depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 17, as

amended herein. Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, fourth paragraph, “a claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which it refers.” “If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.” MPEP 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed.Cir. 1988). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18-24, as amended herein, are patentable over DeRolf et al., Gilliland, hitag, and/or Cecchi et al.

Claims 26-30, as amended herein, depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 25, as amended herein. Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, fourth paragraph, “a claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which it refers.” “If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious.” MPEP 2143.03; *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed.Cir. 1988). Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26-30, as amended herein, are patentable over DeRolf et al., Gilliland, hitag, and/or Cecchi et al.

Having dealt with all of the outstanding objections and/or rejections of the claims, Applicants submit that the application as amended is in condition for allowance, and an allowance at an early date is respectfully solicited. In the event there are any fee deficiencies or additional fees are payable, please charge them, or credit an overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 170055.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dale F. Regelman/

Dale F. Regelman, Ph.D.
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 45,625

QUARLES & BRADY LLP
One South Church Avenue
Tucson, Arizona 85701

TEL 520-770-8703
FAX 520-770-2233

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is herewith being electronically transmitted via Electronic Filing System to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

/Reena Mendez/

Signature

August 3, 2011

Date of Signature

QUARLES & BRADY LLP
One South Church Avenue
Tucson, Arizona 85701

TEL 520-770-8703
FAX 520-770-2233